

224,

M.R.O. 1-20,002-12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages..... 94
(2) Date of repair..... 11th, 12th and 16th Aug
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	554,	Press
B.P. No.	Back 73-75,	Mis.
Dated 5. 5. 1874. 196		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

112

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

Read the following:—

No. 73. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th March 1874,
No. 665.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,591, dated 16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of 7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that the Mansubdar should not have any water.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October 1873, No. 2,099.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd September 1873, No. 383.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English translation.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 23rd January 1874, No. 25.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.

112

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

Read the following:—

No. 73. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th March 1874,
No. 665.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,591, dated 16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of 7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that the Mansubdar should not have any water.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October 1873, No. 2,099.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd September 1873, No. 383.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English translation.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 23rd January 1874, No. 25.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.
5th May 1874.

CERTAIN villages belonging to the Rampah Mansubdar and certain villages belonging to Government obtain water from the Buradaculva and it has been decided that the Mansubdar has a right to "a sufficient" quantity of water for his tank, but cannot obtain it by damming the stream above the Government villages.

2. The Mansubdar threw a bund across the stream in 1868, and the Sub-Collector in deciding that he had no right to do so directed him to get his water "as heretofore from a channel taking off from the Buradaculva above the Puttamamimidoddi anicut."

3. When the case was first reported to the Board it was represented that the Mansubdar had been in the habit of getting his water by throwing a bund across the stream, and that when this was prohibited he was promised the use of the old channel as a kind of compensation. Both these points are now disputed but the papers leave no room for doubt that the Mansubdar had often thrown a temporary dam across the stream, and that when his right to erect a substantial dam was decided against he was induced to believe that "a sufficient" supply of water would be secured in some other way. It appears that the old channel in its present state does not convey enough water to the Mansubdar's tank, and that the District Engineer has told the Mansubdar not to deepen or widen it because he will injure land belonging to the village of Kottapally, through which the channel passes, in doing so, and has pointed out to him another line. The Mansubdar objects to this other line as too expensive, but is ready to pay compensation for land taken up in widening the old channel.

4. So far as the Board can judge the Mansubdar has a right to get water from the old channel, and Government ought in good faith to help him. The Collector and District Engineer should endeavour to arrange the matter in some way. If possible the old channel should be made serviceable and the supply to the Mansubdar and Kottapally distributed by regulating sluices. If not the new line should be surveyed and marked out, but the Mansubdar must supply the necessary funds.

5. The Board resolve to report the conduct of the Range Officer Mr. Hannan for the notice of Government. When he was removing the bund above referred to, the Mansubdar's Vakeel presented an order which the Tahsildar had issued allowing the bund to be raised. This order was the result of an error of judgment, but there was no need on that account to show discourtesy to the officer who issued it. Mr. Hannan took the paper and tore it in two. The Mansubdar then wrote and asked for his reasons. Mr. Hannan replied that he tore up the document because the power of settling irrigation disputes belonged to Range Officers and the Public Works Department and not to the Collector or Tahsildar, neither of whom had any such authority. When called upon for explanation Mr. Hannan explained the tearing up of the document to some extent by stating that the Mansubdar's agent who gave it to him was impertinent and he was much provoked, but his only explanation about his most improper letter to the Mansubdar is contained in these words addressed to the District Engineer:—"The Mansubdar wrote to me some time afterwards to know why I destroyed this document and the original letter forwarded with your Memorandum

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department
5th May 1874.

under reply was my answer, a translation of which Mr. Foster sent to the Board of Revenue. *I am unable to state whether it was a correct one or not as it was not sent to me.*

No italicised original.

No. 74. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSS, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 2nd July 1873, No. 214.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a copy of Acting Head Assistant Collector (in charge of Sub-Collectorate) letter of the 19th May, No. 173, with its enclosures, copies of correspondence between that officer and the Department of Public Works relative to the repair of an irrigation channel which supplies water to the tanks of the Mansubdar of Rampah in Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages, in the Mansubdari in the Kottapalli Division.

2. It will be seen that Buradaculva, a hill stream, supplies water to the Mansubdari villages named, as also to some Government villages. The Mansubdar appears to have been in the habit of throwing a mud anicut across the culva near the entrance of his supply channel, and carry the water to his tanks. The Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, and the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, were of opinion that an anicut so thrown was improperly put up, removed it, and allowed the Mansubdar to repair and use an old irrigation channel close by. The Department of Public Works, including the District Engineer, first expressed their willingness to mark out and repair the channel so as to secure a sufficient supply of water to the Mansubdar's fields, but they latterly declined to do anything with it. Rightly or wrongly, the Mansubdar was promised the use of the old irrigation channel, and I beg to recommend that the promise be fulfilled. I therefore request the Board's sanction to this course.

3. The original award of arbitration referred to in Mr. Pearce's letter, paragraph 7, is not to be found on record, probably having been destroyed with the old records.

4. The Department of Public Works seem to think that disputes as to the irrigating of land are not cognizable by the Revenue authorities. I beg to enclose translation of Mr. Hannan's reply to the Thanedar of the Mansubdar, dated the 19th August 1869, No. 73, and the Board will notice that he has confessedly destroyed certain documents issued by the Revenue Department in regard to irrigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. L. PEARSE, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 19th May 1873, No. 173.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for your perusal, copies of correspondence which took place between this Office and the Department of Public Works on the subject of the Vernacular record, as per accompanying list enclosed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

Rampah Mansubdar being allowed to repair an old channel from the Buradacalva, a hill stream situated in the Rajahmundry Taluk, near the village of Kottapalli, and request your instructions on the subject.

2. The above Buradacalva takes its rise from the hills in the Rampah country. The irrigation tanks of Yerrampalem, Lentapalli, and Irankapalli villages belonging to the Mansubdar, and those of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Surangapatnam, etc., Government villages, are dependent on this channel for supply of water.

3. In 1863 the Mansubdar of Rampah ran a bund of a permanent nature across the said calva so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy-Tahsildar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper, as the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Mansubdar, while the Tahsildar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages; whereupon Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, and Mr. Hannan, the Range Officer, inspected the channel and the bund, and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr. Horsfall directed the Mansubdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply channel, by which certain lands of Kottapalli village are watered, and which commences from the river a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, one of the anicuts across the river.

4. The Mansubdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply-channel in question, Mr. Horsfall stated, in his letter to Mr. Hannan, No. 5, dated 20th February 1871, that he was satisfied, from personal inspection, that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Mansubdar with the required quantity of water, whilst the lands of Kottapalli and other Government villages were also irrigated from that channel, and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this, Mr. Hannan, in his letter, No. 43, dated 6th May 1871, declared that he had no objection to the Mansubdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr. Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth and breadth of the channel and fall of water. Mr. Gribble permitted the Mansubdar to repair the channel in question, subject to the conditions proposed by the Range Officer, and requested Mr. Hannan to see if the Mansubdar conformed to the conditions laid down by him. Then the Mansubdar requested Mr. Gribble to have the line of the channel marked out by the Department of Public Works, and was, in reply, directed to apply to the Range Officer himself. He also petitioned the Superintending Engineer to have the channel repaired by the Department of Public Works, agreeing to bear all costs himself, and was informed by that officer that instructions had been sent to the Range Officer to order the Overseer to carry out the repairs.

5. When Mr. Stuart was at Kottapalli last year the Mansubdar's son produced before him an order from the Overseer. Finding its purport to be at variance with the Inayatnamas issued to the Mansubdar by the Superintending Engineer and Messrs. Horsfall and Gribble, he wrote a letter to Mr. Hannan on the 1st December 1871, stating that when the bund constructed by the Mansubdar was removed permission was granted to him to widen the said channel near Puttamamididoddi anicut, and that this promise should be kept if possible. He further stated that the Mansubdar was ready to pay compensation for any land required in Kottapalli for the purpose; that there was no reason to think that the widening of the channel would injure the Kottapalli lands in any appreciable degree; and that the Mansubdar would be instructed to understand that his right to the water would only commence after the want of the Kottapalli people was satisfied. The Range Officer replied on the 13th of that month that, as the channel passes through the Kottapalli lands, it is, from its head until it leaves Kottapalli lands, the property of the Kottapalli ryots, and that the Mansubdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kottapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer (*vide* translation of Mr. Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer).

6. The Mansubdar having again applied to this Office, Mr. Stuart wrote to Mr. Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for by the Mansubdar

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

marked out, and was, in answer, informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer, who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Mansubdar is entitled only to water drained off Kottapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Mansubdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the bund removed by the Range Officer. He has ten tanks in three villages, the main supply of which he states to be from this river. One of the documents produced is an unauthenticated copy of the decision of a Panchayet convened in 1852 under orders of the Collector. From this it appears that the water brought down by the supply channel carried from the main channel should be shared equally by the Mansubdar and the Kottapalli ryots after certain other lands of Kottapalli were irrigated. The other document is a letter addressed in 1863 to the Mansubdar by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry communicating the permission of the Supervisor to the Mansubdar to repair a certain anicut and to take water to his tanks. One of these anicuts, called Peddakurimidi, is said by the Mansubdar to be across the main channel and the same that was removed by Mr. Hannan; but the Kottapalli people say that this anicut is one across the supply channel.

8. Whatever the previous right of the Mansubdar may be, Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Hannan gave him permission, when the bund put up by him was removed, to take water through a channel dug from the main channel a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, and Mr. Stuart sees no reason to withdraw that permission. It is most probable that it was usual to put a small temporary sand or mud dam across the river at the entrance of the supply channel leading from the river to the Mansubdar's tanks, and that the Mansubdar, by making this bund so large and strong as to turn all the water, brought upon himself a prohibition from Mr. Horsfall which was more sweeping than right to have been. Mr. Stuart thinks that the Public Works Department should abide by the terms then promised to the Mansubdar by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam at this point, and should assist him in any way they can to widen the Kottapalli channel as he proposes to do.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 9.—Copies of Correspondence.

THE Board are of opinion that the promise made to the Mansubdar ought to be fulfilled if possible. They desire that the Collector will communicate with the District Engineer, and, when advised by him, report by what means it is possible to afford the Mansubdar a supply of water while the interests of the Kottapalli ryots are respected.

2. The Collector will also forward the letter (herewith returned) of the Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, to the District Engineer, and request him to obtain information from the Assistant Engineer as to whether he acknowledges that letter to be a true copy of one written by him, and whether he wishes to offer any explanation thereof.

No. 75.

ORDER THEREON, 5th May 1874, No. 554.

Miscellaneous.

THE Mansubdar is clearly entitled to water, and measures should be adopted at once to determine the quantity and supply it or enable him to procure it.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.

2. The subject of paragraph 5 will be considered in the Public Work Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 16th August 1873.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 2nd July 1873, No. 214:—

I HAVE the honour to forward, herewith, copy of Acting Head Assistant Collector (in charge of Sub-Collectorate) letter of the 19th May, No. 173, with its enclosures, copies of correspondence between that officer and the Department of Public Works, relative to the repair of an irrigation channel which supplies water to the tanks of the Mansubdar of Rampah in Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli Villages, in the Mansubdari in the Kottapalli Division.

2. It will be seen that Buradacalva, a hill stream, supplies water to the Mansubdari villages named, as also to some Government villages. The Mansubdar appears to have been in the habit of throwing a mud anicut across the Calva near the entrance of his supply-channel and carry the water to his tanks. The Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, and the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, were of opinion that an anicut so thrown was improperly put up, removed it, and allowed the Mansubdar to repair and use an old irrigation channel close by. The Department of Public Works, including the District Engineer, first expressed their willingness to mark out and repair the channel so as to secure a sufficient supply of water to the Mansubdar's fields, but they latterly declined to do anything with it. Rightly or wrongly, the Mansubdar was promised the use of the old irrigation channel, and I beg to recommend that the promise be fulfilled. I therefore request the Board's sanction to this course.

3. The original award of arbitration referred to in Mr. Pearse's letter, paragraph 7, is not to be found on record, probably having been destroyed with the old records.

4. The Department of Public Works seem to think that disputes as to the irrigating of land are not cognizable by the Revenue authorities. I beg to enclose translation of Mr. Hannan's reply to the Thanedar of the Mansubdar, dated the 19th August 1869, No. 73, and the Board will notice that he has confessedly destroyed certain documents issued by the Revenue Department in regard to irrigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. L. PEARSE, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 19th May 1873, No. 173.

I HAVE the honour to forward, herewith, for your perusal, copies of correspondence which took place between this office and the Department of Public Works on the subject of the Rampah Mansubdar being allowed to repair an old channel from the Buradacalva, a hill stream situated in the Rajahmundry Taluk, near the village of Kottapalli, and request your instructions on the subject.

2. The above Buradacalva takes its rise from the mountains in the Rampah Country. The irrigation tanks of Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages belonging to the Mansubdar, and those of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Streerangapatnam, etc., Government villages, are dependent on this channel for supply of water.

Cost. of 1874
REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

By, Secy, to Secy.

Dated 18th May.

Secy.

Encl.

G. O. 1873, No. 173.

MAY.

No. 73-75.

Water Supply from Buradacalva, Godavery District.—Considers that Mansubdar of Rampah is entitled to —; requests immediate adoption of measures for determining quantity of water, and for its supply; and directs that the conduct of the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, be considered in the Public Works Department.



3. In 1868 the Mansubdar of Rampah ran a high bund of a permanent nature across the said Calva so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy Tahsildar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper as all the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Mansubdar, while the Tahsildar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages, whereupon Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, and Mr. Hannan, the Range Officer, inspected the channel and the bund and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr. Horsfall directed the Mansubdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply-channel, by which certain lands of Kottapalli village are watered, and which commences from the river a little above the Puttamamidoddi Anicut, one of the anicuts across the river.

4. The Mansubdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply-channel in question, Mr. Horsfall stated, in his letter to Mr. Hannan, No. 5, dated 20th February 1871, that he was satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Mansubdar with the required quantity of water whilst the lands of Kottapalli and other Government villages were also irrigated from that channel, and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this, Mr. Hannan, in his letter, No. 43, dated 6th May 1871, declared that he had no objection to the Mansubdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr. Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth and breadth of the channel and full of water. Mr. Gribble permitted the Mansubdar to repair the channel in question subject to the conditions proposed by the Range Officer, and requested Mr. Hannan to see if the Mansubdar conformed to the conditions laid down by him. Then the Mansubdar requested Mr. Gribble to have the line of the channel marked out by the Department of Public Works, and was in reply directed to apply to the Range Officer himself. He also petitioned the Superintending Engineer to have the channel repaired by the Department of Public Works, agreeing to bear all costs himself, and was informed by that officer that instructions had been sent to the Range Officer to order the Overseer to carry out the repairs.

5. When Mr. Stuart was at Kottapalli last year the Mansubdar's son produced before him an order from the Overseer. Finding its purport to be at variance with the Inayatnannas issued to the Mansubdar by the Superintending Engineer and Messrs. Horsfall and Gribble, he wrote a letter to Mr. Hannan on the 1st December 1871 stating that when the bund constructed by the Mansubdar was removed permission was granted to him to widen the said channel near Puttamamidoddi Anicut and that this promise should be kept if possible. He further stated that the Mansubdar was ready to pay compensation for any land required in Kottapalli for the purpose; that there was no reason to think that the widening of the channel would injure the Kottapalli lands in any appreciable degree; and that the Mansubdar would be instructed to understand that his right to the water would only commence after the want of the Kottapalli people was satisfied. The Range Officer replied on the 13th of that month that, as the channel passes through the Kottapalli lands, it is, from its head until it leaves Kottapalli lands, the property of the Kottapalli ryots and that the Mansubdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kottapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer (*vide* translation of Mr. Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer).

6. The Mansubdar having again applied to this office, Mr. Stuart wrote to Mr. Hannan on the 19th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for by the Mansubdar marked out, and was in answer informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer, who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Mansubdar is entitled only to water drained off Kottapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Mansubdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the bund removed by the Range Officer. He has ten tanks in three villages the main supply of which he states to be from this river. One of the documents produced is an unauthenticated copy of the decision of a Panchayet convened in 1852 under orders of the Collector. From this it appears

that the water brought down by the supply-channel carried from the main channel should be shared equally by the Mansubdar and the Kottapalli ryots after certain other lands of Kottapalli were irrigated. The other document is a letter addressed in 1863 to the Mansubdar by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry communicating the permission of the Supervisor to the Mansubdar to repair a certain anicut and to take water to his tanks. One of these anicuts, called Peddakurimidi, is said by the Mansubdar to be across the main channel and the same that was removed by Mr. Hannan; but the Kottapalli people say that this anicut is one across the supply-channel.

8. Whatever the previous right of the Mansubdar may be, Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Hannan gave him permission, when the bund put up by him was removed, to take water through a channel dug from the main channel a little above the Puttamamidoddi Anicut, and Mr. Stuart sees no reason to withdraw that permission. It is most probable that it was usual to put a small temporary sand or mud dam across the river at the entrance of the supply-channel leading from the river to the Mansubdar's tanks and that the Mansubdar, by making this bund so large and strong as to turn all the water, brought upon himself a prohibition from Mr. Horsfall which was more sweeping than right to have been. Mr. Stuart thinks that the Public Works Department should abide by the terms then promised to the Mansubdar by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam at this point and should assist him in any way they can to widen the Kottapalli Channel as he proposes to do.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 9.—Copies of Correspondence.

THE Board are of opinion that the promise made to the Mansubdar ought to be fulfilled if possible. They desire that the Collector will communicate with the District Engineer, and, when advised by him, report by what means it is possible to afford the Mansubdar a supply of water while the interests of the Kottapalli ryots are respected.

2. The Collector will also forward the letter (herewith returned) of the Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, to the District Engineer and request him to obtain information from the Assistant Engineer as to whether he acknowledges that letter to be a true copy of one written by him, and whether he wishes to offer any explanation thereof.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. ST. A. GOODRICH,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of the Godavery District,
with copy of letter of Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, No. 73.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

No. 665.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 24th March 1874.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,501, dated 16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of 7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that the Mansubdar should not have any water.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October 1873, No. 2,099.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd September 1873, No. 383.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English translation.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 28th January 1874, No. 25.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.

1873.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 16th AUGUST 1873, No. 1,591.

Encl.

Received

No. 1591/74

AUGUST.

No. 1,591.

Mansubdar of Rampah—in Godavery District.—Collector to report, after communicating with District Engineer, how a supply of water can be afforded to—without injuring interests of Kotapalli ryots, and to obtain certain information through that officer regarding a letter addressed by Assistant Engineer with reference to irrigation of Mansubdar.

CERTAIN villages belonging to the Rampah Mansubdar and certain villages belonging to Government obtain water from the Buradaculva and it has been decided that the Mansubdar has a right to "a sufficient" quantity of water for his tanks, but cannot obtain it by damming the stream above the Government villages.

2. The Mansubdar threw a bund across the stream in 1863, and the Sub-Collector in deciding that he had no right to do so directed him to get his water "as heretofore from a channel taking off from the Buradaculva above the Puttamammidoddi anicut."

3. When the case was first reported to the Board it was represented that the Mansubdar had been in the habit of getting his water by throwing a bund across the stream, and that when this was prohibited he was promised the use of the old channel as a kind of compensation. Both these points are now disputed but the papers leave no room for doubt that the Mansubdar had often thrown a temporary dam across the stream, and that when his right to erect a substantial dam was decided against he was induced to believe that "a sufficient" supply of water would be secured in some other way. It appears that the old channel in its present state does not convey enough water to the Mansubdar's tank, and that the District Engineer has told the Mansubdar not to deepen or widen it because he will injure land belonging to the village of Kottapally, through which the channel passes, in doing so, and has pointed out to him another line. The Mansubdar objects to this other line as too expensive, but is ready to pay compensation for land taken up in widening the old channel.

4. So far as the Board can judge the Mansubdar has a right to get water from the old channel, and Government ought in good faith to help him. The Collector and District Engineer should endeavour to arrange the matter in some way. If possible the old channel should be made serviceable and the supply to the Mansubdar and Kottapally distributed by regulating sluices. If not the new line should be surveyed and marked out, but the Mansubdar must supply the necessary funds.

5. The Board resolve to report the conduct of the Range Officer Mr. Hannan for the notice of Government. When he was removing the bund above referred to, the Mansubdar's Vakeel presented an order which the Tahsildar had issued allowing the bund to be raised. This order was the result of an error of judgment, but there was no need on that account to show discourtesy to the officer who issued it. Mr. Hannan took the paper and tore it in two. The Mansubdar then wrote and asked for his reasons. Mr. Hannan replied that he tore up the document because the power of settling irrigation disputes belonged to Range Officers and the Public Works Department and not to the Collector or Tahsildar, neither of whom had any such authority. When called upon for explanation Mr. Hannan explained the tearing up of the document to some extent by stating that the Mansubdar's agent who gave it to him was impertinent and he was much provoked, but his only explanation about his most improper letter to the Mansubdar is contained in these words addressed to the District Engineer:—"The Mansubdar wrote to me some time afterwards to know why I destroyed this document and the original letter forwarded with your Memorandum

under reply was my answer, a translation of which Mr. Foster sent to the Board of Revenue. *I am unable to state whether it was a correct one or not as it was not sent to me.*

Not italicised original.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

J. E. M.
Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591,
with its original enclosures, and five original enclosures
to Collector's letter of 31st January 1874, to be returned.
,, the Acting Collector of the Godavery District, with Range Officer's telugoo letter, returned.
Copy to the District Engineer, Godavery District.

No. 5. Godavery Sub-division
 7th. C. P. the
 20th. to
 from
 The Acting P. Godavery
 The officer in charge
 No. 6 Range
 Jamnabai
 Sir
 I have the honor to forward
 a petition received from the
 Rampas regarding the supply of water
 from the Banda Calva. You will see
 that the petition is unauthorized
 across the above Calva & diversion
 of the water to his lands and that
 was cut by you in 1868. and the
 further prohibited by me
 and by the Government in future. He
 can get water at all

No 11574
 Dec. 1874. Dept.

Board of Revenue,
 MADRAS.

PROCEEDING, 21st MARCH 1874, No. 665.

Approved by
 Encl. 2
 Mr. B. G. (B. G.)

Received 3

MARCH.

No. 665.

Water supply - from Buradaculva, in Goda-
 very District. - Orders passed on claims of Man-
 subdar of Rampah and of Kotapally Ryots to -
 conduct of Range Officer Mr. Hannan in tearing
 up an order issued by Tahsilidar on this subject,
 etc., brought to notice of Government.

S.O. No 554 - 5 May 1874 -

229. 11th Dec 1874
 13.

Godavery
 Sub-Commissioner
 Godavery
 20th Dec
 The Acting Sub-Commissioner
 Godavery
 The officer in charge
 No. 6 Range
 I have the honor to forward
 a petition received from the
 Rampas regarding the supply of water
 from the Runda Calve. You will see
 that the petition had been authorized
 across the above Calve & directed
 of the water to his lands and that
 was cut by you in 1868 and the
 further prohibited by me
 and I intend in future to
 let him get water at all

No 11574
 Dec. 1874.

Board of Revenue,
 MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 21st March 1874, No. 665.

B. V. R. S. S. S.
 B. V. R. S. S. S.
 B. V. R. S. S. S.

Received 3

MARCH.

No. 665.

Water supply - from Buradaculla, in Goda-
 very District. - Orders passed on claims of Man-
 subdar of Rampas and of Kotapally ryots to -
 conduct of Range Officer Mr. Hannan in tearing
 up an order issued by Tahsiladar on this subject,
 etc., brought to notice of Government.

S.O. No 554 - 5 May 1874 -

22nd April 1874
 23rd April 1874
 24th April 1874

exaggerated statement of the case. I am
 satisfied from personal inspection that
 existing channel is quite insufficient to
 supply the Minisut-dar with the required
 quantity of water. ^{while} At present the lands
 of Stapilly and other Government villages
 are irrigated from this channel. I
 therefore think that you will have the channel
 deepened and widened as early as possible.
 I think the Minisut-dar is ready to have
 necessary work executed at his own
 expense, and see no objection to his doing
 so, under such restrictions and supervision
 as may be deemed necessary. I have no
 objection to the work being completed before the
 rainy season commences. I have signed
 the order inquired for. J. C. Warfall
 Acting Sub Collector.
 (True copy)
 Wm. H. Webb
 By H. H. Webb

No. 43. No. 11. 19. 3
 Godavery
 Samuel
 6th
 From
 The Assistant En
 (No. 6 Range)
 Sir
 In reply to your letter of the
 instant I have the honor to
 see no objection to the Rampas
 deepening and widening the channel
 at his own cost as proposed by
 in his letter of 5 dated 20th Feb.
 In my opinion the width of the
 should not exceed 5 yards. The
 channel at head should be the
 as deep bed of river at that point
 carried away with a fall in

I have the honor to be
Sir.

Your most obedient servant.

Signed / J. Gannan.

Assistant Engineer G.D.G.

(True copy /

1. Etienne

By 42 to collection
in charge.

By 42 to collection
in charge.

No 49.

Godanary

Sub Coll

219

Page

2347

From

The Acting Sub Coll

Godanary

To

The Officer in Charge

No. VI Range.

Samudratte.

Sir

In reply to your letter
to the Assistant, I have the honor
to inform you that I have issued orders
to the Munsabdar of Rampur to
inquire into and request that you
if the Munsabdar conforms to
laid down in your letter under

I have the

Signed /

(True copy /

Etienne

By 42 to collection
in charge.

in getting to be allowed, to dig for and widen
 the above channels is of course, to drain off
 more water. the question then is will this
 injure the Kolipilly lands, the Rigot say
 it will, and that the Munsabdar already
 gets all the water they can spare which is
 all he is entitled to.

I have the honor to be

Your most obedient servant

Signed / J. Hannan

Assistant Engineer

(True copy)

Etienne

By the Sub Collector

Chargé

the 20th February & 1st December 1871 respectively.
 & Your replies Nos 43 & 312 of the 6th May
 and 13th December respectively.

to 10/

Godavery District

Sub Collector's Office

Caenada

10th August 1872.

From

The Acting Sub Collector

Godavery District.

The Officer in Charge

No 6 Ramgarh

Sir

Referring to the correspondence
 noted in the margin, I have the honor
 to state that the Munsabdar of Ramgarh
 asks that lines may be marked out where
 he may dig a channel to feed his tanks.
 The petitions of the Munsabdar and
 its enclosures are herewith forwarded
 for your perusal and return. and
 I request that you will let me
 know if you can have the lines

The enclosures of your letter are herewith
returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours most obedient servant

Resident J. P. Munawar

Assistant Engineer

True Copy

Enclosure

in charge

Recd. 11/5/74
J. P. Munawar
11/5/74
11/5/74

125
No. 125
22nd July 1874
Rajahmundry

From

21.2

The Sub Collector

Godavari District.

To

The Officer in charge

No. 6 Range.

Samalotta.

Sir

In forwarding the enclosed
I have the honor to request that
you will be good enough to inform me
if the statement therein made that
the Tanks of Yessampalem and two
other villages in the Rampa Munsiff's
Estate have received no supply of
water and that water cannot flow
from Puttanamidi-doddi. And that

three tanks is true.

Signed J. H. Worrell,

By Sub Collector.

True copy

J. H. Worrell
Sub Collector.

No 253

XII Range Office

Samulcottah

16th September
1873

32.2

From

J. H. Worrell

Esqre
Asst Engineer

To

J. H. Worrell Esqre
Sub Collector
Godavery

I have the honor to request
you will be good enough to return
me this office letter No 2519 dated
31st August 1870 as I find on
further enquiry, that the statements
therein made are not quite correct.
There is a channel above the
Pottamamede Doory ancient
by which water can and has
hitherto been supplied to the
Rampa Moonsubdar's tank - this
channel also supplies some
Government

government Tanks. Whether the
channel requires to be repaired or
not, I do not know. Since I
wrote the above letter, the Rampa
Moonsubdar's upper tank has
received a supply. There has
been as yet but very little water
in the Kottapilly River and it
is only the upper or Kottapilly
Tanks that have up to the present
received any water. - the Government
Tanks lower down have received
no supply and the land holders
under them have more reason to
complain than the Moonsubdar.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedt servt

(Signed) J. Hannan
Asst Engineer.

/ True Copy /
J. G. Horsfall
Sub Collector
to B Range Godanur
District

No 161 35 2

To J. Hannan Esquire
Asst Engineer
to B Range.

21st September 1870
Coconada

Subject.
your letter No 253 of the 16th
Instant.

Returns the letter No 219 of
the 31st ultimo as requested
in the letter above referred to.

(Signed) J. G. Horsfall
Asst Sub Collector

/ True Copy /

J. G. Horsfall
Sub Collector

Gokhavasani

No 3

20th February 1871

From 37.3

The Sub Collector

Godavari District.

To The Officer in charge

No 6 Range Samudra.

Sir

I have the honor to forward
herewith a petition received from
the Munsabdar of Raupar regarding
the supply channel to his tanks from
the Benda Calava. You will remember
that the Munsabdar had unauthorizedly
run a bund across the Calava
and diverted the whole of the water
to his lands and that this bund was
cut by you in 1868 and the Munsabdar
was further prohibited by me from

raising any such fund in future.

He now complains that he can get no water at all, and though this is an exaggerated statement of the case, I am satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel is quite insufficient to supply the Mundabur with the requisite quantity of water. ^{while} what at present the lands of Cottapalle and other Government villages are also irrigated from this channel. I beg therefore that you will have the channel deepened and widened as early as possible.

I believe the Mundabur is ready to have the necessary work executed at his own expense, and see no objection to his doing so under such restrictions and supervision

39.F
as you may deem necessary

In any case the work should be completed before the ensuing rains commence.

Signed / J. S. Strofall
Sub Collector

(True Copy)

J. S. Strofall
Sub Collector

No 39

H. G. Rajahmundry.
2nd May 1871

From

The Ag. Sub Collector
Godavery District

To

The Officer
in charge No 11 Range
Samulcotta.

Sir

In forwarding herewith
a petition presented by the
Munsabdar of Rampa Country
regarding a supply channel
to his tanks from the J. H. the
palli channel, I have the
honor to request that you will
be good enough to send me
an early answer to Mr. Horsfall's
letter.

letter no 5 dated 20th February
last.

(Signed) J. D. B. Gribble
Ag Sub Collector
(One Copy)

J. G. Horsfall
Sub Collector.

No 43

No VI Range Office
Godavery District
Samulettah
6th May 1871

From The Assistant Engineer
No 6 Range Godavery
District

To The Ag Sub Collector
Godavery District

Sir,

In reply to your letter no 39
dated 2^d Instant, I have the
honor to state that I see no
objection to the Rumpu Moonsab-
dar's deepening and widening the
channel in question at his own
cost as proposed by Mr. Horsfall
in his letter no 5 dated 20th
February last. In my opinion the

the width of the channel should not exceed 5 yards. The bed of channel at head should be the same level as deep bed of river at that point and be carried away with a fall not extending 1 foot per mile.

I have the honor to be
Sir

your most obedt servant.

(Signed) J. Hannan

Asst Engineer Godavari

(True Copy)

J. S. Simola
Sub Collector.

459
No 49

23rd May 1871
Rajahmundry.

From

The Sub Collector
Godavari District

To

The Officer in Charge
No II Range
Samuelcottah.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No 43 dated 6th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that I have issued orders permitting the Mansabdar of Rumpfa to repair the channel in question; and request that

1871 to the Munsabdar and
to an order on the same subject
issued by Mr. Horsfall.

2 It appears that permission
to widen a certain Government
channel and to make use of it
was granted to the Munsabdar
when a ~~road~~ bridge constructed by him
across the river at Kottapally
was ~~in~~ ^{ordered} by Mr. Horsfall
and the Range Officer, but
that the Kottapally Villagers
object and that another and
longer line is now proposed.
I am of opinion that the
promises made to the Munsabdar
should be kept if possible
and that he should be aided
in widening the Kottapally
channel

49. ⁸
Channel. He is ready if ne-
cessary to pay Compensation
for any land required in Ko-
ttapally for that purpose and
I see no reason to think that the
widening of the channel will
injure the Kottapally lands in
any appreciable degree. of course
the Munsabdar must under-
stand that the Kottapally
people have the first right
to the water and that his
right will only commence when
their wants have been satisfied.
I request you will be so good
as to let me know if you find
such objections to the plan
proposed as would in your
opinion justify the withdrawal
of

of the permission already
granted to him to which he
now seems to me to have a good
claim.

(Signed) S. J. Stuart
Sg Sub Collector
(True Copy.)

S. S. Ansfah
Sub Collector.

51.9
Copy of ~~the~~ verbal instructions
of the Range Officer.

The channel which is to be
marked out for the Numpu
Mandubdar is to branch off
from Kottapally river north of
Puttamamidi duddy anicut, and
is to run along the boundary of
Kottapally lands and to cross
the Gaggampetta Road about
 $\frac{3}{4}$ mile east of Puttamamidi
Soddy anicut and to terminate
at the head of feeding channel
which supply Drampalam Tank.

Kottapally } (True copy)
26th November }

D. W. Spencer
Taluk Officer.

(True copy) (True copy)
S. S. Ansfah (Signed) S. J. Stuart
Sub Collector Sg Sub Collector

No 312

No 6 Range Office G. D.

Samuelcotta.

529 13th December 1871

From The Assistant Engineer
in charge No 6 Range Godavery

To The Dy Sub Collector
Godavery District.

Sir, In reply to your letter No 148
dated 1st Instant I have the
honor to inform you that I consider
it objectionable to allow the Pumper
Moonsubdar to deepen and widen
the channel in question which
passes through the Kottapilly
lands. This channel from its
head until it leaves their lands
is the property of the Kottapilly
Koyots; the Moonsubdar is only
entitled

entitled to the water that drains
off their lands into his own channel
lower down. The object of the
Mansubdar in asking to be
allowed to deepen and widen
the above channel is of course,
to drain off more water. the
question then is, will this injure
the Kottapilly lands, the Ryots
say it will and that the Moon-
subdar already gets all the water
they can spare which is all he
is entitled to.

I have the honor to be
Sir

your most Obedt Servt
(Signed) J. Hannan
Asst Engineer
(True Copy)

J. C. Annala
Sub Collector.

1. Sub Collector's letter Nos 58/148
of the 20th February and 1st December 1871
respectively.

2. Your replies Nos 1383/2 of the 6th May
and 13th December respectively.

12-101

10-8-72

Received

55.9

From

The Sub Collector
Godavery District.

To
The Officer in charge
P. B. Range.

Sir,

Referring to the correspondence
noted in the margin, I have the
honor to state that the Munsubdar
of Pampa asks that lines may be marked
out where he may dig a channel to
feed his tanks. The petition of the
Munsubdar and its enclosures are herewith
forwarded for your perusal
and return, and I request that you
will let me know if you can have

lines asked for, marked out.

10-8-72

(Signed) R. J. Stuart.
Sub Collector.

(True Copy)

J. G. Ansford
Sub Collector.

No 206

No 6 Range Office Gt

Samuelotta

57.9 17th August 1872

From

The Assistant Engineer
in charge No 6 Range Gt

To
The Acting Sub Collector
of Godavari District

Sir

With reference to your letter of the
10th instant No 101. I have the honor
to inform you that I cannot mark out
the channel asked for by the Panipar
Munimbar, unless directed to do so
by the Superintending Engineer who has
already instructed me not to do so.

The channel, if dug, will deprive good
lands of water and may throw them out
of cultivation. The enclosures of your
letter are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

(Signed) J. Hannon.
Assistant Engineer

(True Copy)

J. S. Stoddard
Sub Collector

1874. I
in a letter from the
Collector Godavari
to the District
Magistrate, the
Board of Revenue
Chargers

Dated 31st Jan 1874

Revenue

Nº 21.

Encl. No 6/73/74

Copies of copies

for revenue referees

to in the Sub Collector's

letter:

Rev. 1154/74

P. W. 2996/74.

Pl. 75 March 1874

Encl. 13 No 73.

No 73

To Mallegata Venkayya gar
Tanasar & Sumanthyan
on behalf of the Mansab
dar of Rampah Estate

In reply to your letter of
12th Instant, I have to state as
follows.

The authority for settling
the irrigation affairs (disputes)
is vested in the Range officers
of the Public Works Department, but,
neither the Collector nor the District
has any such authority. The docu-
ments executed by them (or over-
viewed by them) for the purpose
have therefore been destroyed.

Office of the 6th Range (S.D.) J. Hannon
Camp Simantata Assistant Engineer
19th August 1869. 11th Range. Godavari

(True Translation)

W. Foster
Asst. Collector

6173 619

W. L. Foster Engraver
Ag. Collector

I have the honor to forward here-
with for your perusal Copies of
Correspondence which took place
between this office and the Depart-
ment of Public Works on the subject
of the Pampa Munshadar being
allowed to repair an old channel
from the Burada Calwa, a hill
stream situated in the Rajahmundry
Taluk near the village of Kottapalli
and request your instructions on the
subject. The above Burada Calwa
takes its rise from the mountains
in the Pampa Country. The irrigation
tanks of Gircampalem, Pentapalli
and Inlakapalli villages belong-
ing to the Munshadar and those
of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Sree-
nagarapatnam &c. Government villages are

Travellers

Yours

The Collector

Feb. 8, 1871

Dr. J. J. Schuch

The Board of

Christine Hedberg

W. A. R. 1873

Feb 24 1877

2 Dec 1919

1. *Amelanchier* *laevis* (Mill.) B.S.P.

Letter of 1/11/32

Reminiscences of

The Shakers

of the Montcalm

1888

Aug. 11/57/59

Ph. 226/15

are dependant on this channel for supply of water.

3 In 1868 the Munshdar of Rampur ran a high bund of permanent nature across the said Calwa so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy Tahsil dar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper as all the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Munshdar while the Tahsil dar reported that the putting of the bund would cut off the Government villages, where upon Mr Horsfall the late Subcollector and Mr Hauman the Range Officer inspected the channel and the bund, and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr Horsfall directed the Munshdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply channel, by which certain lands of Kottapally Village are watered and which commences from

from the river a little above the Dutta
Munisiddi annicut one
600 yds of the annicut across the river.
4 The Munshdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply channel in question Mr Horsfall states in his letter to Mr Hauman dated 20 February 1871, that he was satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Munshdar with the required quantity of water, whilst the lands of Kottapally and other government villages were also irrigated from that channel and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this Mr Hauman in his letter No 43 dated 6 May 1871 declared that he had no objection to the Munshdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth & breadth of

of the Channel and fall of water
Mr Gribble permitted the Munsabdar
to repair the Channel in question
subject to the conditions proposed
by the Range Officer, and requested
Mr Haccian to see if the Munsabdar
conformed to the conditions laid
down by him. Then the Munsab-
dar requested Mr Gribble to
have the line of the Channel
marked out by the Department
Public Works and was in reply
directed to apply to the Range
Officer himself. He also
petitioned the Superintending
Engineer to have the Channel
repaired by the Department
Public Works agreeing to bear
all costs himself and was informed
by that officer that instructions
had been sent to the Range Officer
to order the overseer to carry out
the repairs.

5 When Mr Stuart was at
Kottapalli last year, the Munsabdar's
son

159
son produced before him an order
from the overseer. Finding it
purport to be at variance with
the Quaghtuamas issued to the
Munsabdar by the Superintending
Engineer and Inspector of fall and
gribble he wrote a letter to Mr
Haccian on the 1st December
1891 stating that when the bund
constructed by the Munsabdar
was removed, permission was
granted to him to widen the said
Channel near Puttannaididoo
Arinab and that this promise
should be kept if possible.
He further stated that the
Munsabdar was ready to
pay compensation for any land
required in Kottapalli for the
purpose, that there was no reason
to think that the widening of the
Channel would injure the Kottapalli
lands in any appreciable degree
and that the Munsabdar would
be

he instructed ^{understand} that his right to the water would only commence after the want of Kattapally people was satisfied. The Range officer replied on the 13^d of that month that as the channel passes through the Kattapalli lands, it is from its head until it leaves Kattapalli lands, the property of the Kattapally Ryots and ^{that} the Munsabdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kattapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer. The translation of Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer.

6. The Munsabdar having again applied to this office, Mr Smith,

57.9
wrote to Mr Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for, by the Munsabdar, marked out, and was in answer informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Munsabdar is entitled only to water drained off Kattapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Munsabdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the land purchased by the Range officer. He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the main supply of which he states

the

he instructed ^{him} under section
that his right to the water should
only commence after the want
of Kattapalli people was
satisfied. The Range officer re-
plied on the 13^d of that month
that as the channel passes through
the Kattapalli lands, it is from
its head until it leaves Kattapalli
lands, the property of the Kattapalli
Rajots and ^{that} the Munsahdar, is only
entitled to the water that drains
off Kattapalli lands into his
own channel lower down. This
officer expressed the same opinion
to the Superintending Engineer in
reply to his letter directing him
to have the channel repaired by
the Overseer. He translated of
Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending
Engineer.

6. The Munsahdar having again
applied to this office, Mr Smart,

57.9
wrote to Mr Hannan on the
10th August last requesting him
to have the lines of the channel
asked for, by the Munsahdar,
marked out, and was in answer
informed that he could not
mark out the channel unless
directed to do so by the Superin-
tending Engineer who had
already instructed him not to
do so.

7. The question is whether
the Munsahdar is entitled only
to water drained off Kattapalli
lands or to the water of the main
river carried through an irrigation
channel. The Munsahdar says
that he is entitled to half the
water brought down by the
channel formerly supplied by
the lands mentioned by the Range officer.
He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the
main supply of which he states to be

he instructed ^{him} ~~him~~ that his right to the water should only commence after the water of Kattapally people was satisfied. The Range officer replied on the 13th of that month that as the channel passes through the Kattapally lands, it is from its head until it leaves Kattapally lands, the property of the Kattapally Rights and ^{that} the Munsabdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kattapally lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer. The translation of Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer.

6. The Munsabdar having again applied to this office, Mr Smith,

67.9
wrote to Mr Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for, by the Munsabdar, marked out, and was in answer informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Munsabdar is entitled only to water drained off Kattapally lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Munsabdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the lands possessed by the Range officer. He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the main supply of which he states to be

This kind so large and strong
as to turn all the water brought
upon himself; a prohibition
from Mr Horsfall which was
more sweeping than right to
have been. Mr Stuart thinks
that the Public Works Department
should abide by the terms
then promised to the Munshar
by way of compensation for
the loss of the right to make
a dam at this point and should
assist him in any way they can
to widen the Kattapally channel
as he proposes to do.

Chancé recd

(Signed) E. L. Parry

Asst. & Assistant Collector
in charge.

(True Copy)

W. Foster

Asst. Collector

From The officer in charge,
No 5 Range, Godavari District
To

1891

known with refd. 18. I enclose and the enclosures as per
Bd. Pro:
1 Heloga letter margin which accompanied it, and

Made 22 Aug. 1873
 No 214
 Recd. 11/54/74
 Copy of the
 Study of the
 letter & copies

of Correspondence
which accompanied
it. J. B. 11/13/85
J. B. 11/13/85
J. B. 11/13/85

No 383. 72.9 23rd September 1872
From The officer in charge
No 5 Range, Godavery District
To The District Engineer
Godavery District

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 19/8 of 1888 and the enclosures as per B. Pro. 1888. I have also the margin which accompanied it, and in reply beg to state that the Ramla Mooring's tanks can be supplied with water by a channel dug from the Kottapilly river, above the Pota named ~~odde~~ ~~amicut~~. The interests of the Kottapilly ryots as well as of the ryots of half a dozen other villages will of course suffer in consequence especially in bad seasons like the present when the water brought down by this river is insufficient for the wants of those villages which have an established right to it.

2. With reference to the proceedings which

124. 25 June 1944
San Diego 1943.

Recd O. C. Aug 8/97
No 214 7
Rev. 1154/3
Copy of the
original record
letter received

the letter
to you E. Collector
of Land survey
District
The Secretary is
in favor of our
measures

of course for me
which accounts
for the
J. H. 2006/24

No 383. 72.2 / 23rd September 1873
 From The officer in charge
 To The District Engineer
 Godavery District.

Sir,
 I have the honor to acknowledge
 the receipt of your letter No 1918 of
 16th instant and the enclosures as per
 B. Pro. 1264 later margin which accompanied it, and
 in reply beg to state that the Ramla
 Moosapada's tank can be supplied
 with water by a channel dug from
 the Kottapilly river, above the Pota
 named doddde amicut. The interests
 of the Kottapilly ryots as well as
 of the ryots of half a dozen other
 villages will of course suffer in
 consequence especially in bad seasons
 like the present when the water
 brought down by this river is insuffi-
 cient for the wants of those villages
 which have an established right to it.
 I will reference to the proceedings
 which

14. 7. 5. 1873
 In H. 10. 73.

Shall be
 From the Collector
 of Godavery
 District
 The Secretary to
 the Board of
 Revenue
 No 22. 8. 1873
 21. 2. 14
 No. 1154/73
 Copy of the
 letter of the
 Collector
 of Godavery
 District
 to the Secretary
 of the Board of
 Revenue
 which accompanied
 it
 21. 2. 14
 21. 2. 14

which accompanied your Memo. Mr. Foster
in his letter to the Board of Revenue
states that the Mowafdar was in
the habit of throwing a sand bund
across the Kottapilly river, this is
incorrect. Since the Amirs came
here some 15 years ago no bund
have been put up across the river.
It was only in 1888 that ^{with} the permission
of the Revenue authorities the Zamindar
threw up a bund some 5 or 6
yards high and directed the entire
stream into his Estate. Immediately
I heard that he had done so, I pro-
ceeded to the spot and had the
bund removed this bund not only
cut off the water supply from some
six or eight poor peasant villages but
seriously endangered the safety of
two of the masonry Amirs' houses.
While engaged in removing the bund
the Rampa Mowafdar's takeel prevented
himself and was exceedingly imperti-
nent and defied me to remove it he
at the same time produced a telegram
letter which he said was a permission
from

753
from the Subedar to put up the bund,
I then informed him that neither the
Subedar nor the Collector had any
authority to interfere with irrigation
works under my charge and without
any reference whatever to me, and
that I did not want to see the Sub-
-siddar's permission as he persisted
however on my taking the letter although
I had several times refused to do so
being considerably provoked I at
last took it from him tore it in two
and handed it back. The Mowafdar
wrote some time afterwards
to know why I destroyed this docu-
-ment and the original letter forward-
-ed with your Memo. under reply was
my answer a translation of which
Mr. Foster sent to Board of Revenue.
I am unable to state whether it was
a correct one or not as it was not
sent to me. I beg to express my regret
for having torn the document in
question the circumstances under
which I did so will I trust be
considered

which accompanied your Memo. Mr. Foster
in his letter to the Board of Revenue
states that the Mowafdar was in
the habit of throwing a sand bund
across the Kottapilly river, this is
incorrect. Since the Amirs came
here some 15 years ago no bund
have been put up across the river.
It was only in 1888 that ^{with} the permission
of the Revenue authorities the Zamindar
threw up a bund some 5 or 6
yards high and directed the entire
stream into his Estate. Immediately
I heard that he had done so, I pro-
ceeded to the spot and had the
bund removed this bund not only
cut off the water supply from some
six or eight poor peasant villages but
seriously endangered the safety of
two of the masonry Amirs' houses.
While engaged in removing the bund
the Rampa Mowafdar's takeal prevented
himself and was exceedingly imperti-
nent and defied me to remove it he
at the same time produced a telegram
letter which he said was a permission
from

753
from the Subedar to put up the bund,
I then informed him that neither the
Subedar nor the Collector had any
authority to interfere with irrigation
works under my charge and without
any reference whatever to me, and
that I did not want to see the Sub-
sedar's permission as he persisted
however on my taking the letter although
I had several times refused to do so
being considerably provoked I at
last took it from him tore it in two
and handed it back. The Mowafdar
wrote some time afterwards
to know why I destroyed this docu-
ment and the original letter forward-
ed with your Memo. under reply was
my answer a translation of which
Mr. Foster sent to Board of Revenue.
I am unable to state whether it was
a correct one or not as it was not
sent to me. I beg to express my regret
for having torn the document in
question the circumstances under
which I did so will I trust be
considered

which accompanied your Memoirs Foster
in his letter to the Board of Revenue
states that the Moonsifdar was in
the habit of throwing a mud bund
across the Kottapilly river, this is
incorrect. Since the Amicus was
built some 15 years ago no bund
have been put up across the river.
It was only in 1888 that ^{with} the permission
of the Revenue authorities the Zamindar
threw up a bund some 5 or 6
yards high and directed the entire
stream into his Estate. Immediately
I heard that he had done so, I pro-
ceeded to the spot and had the
bund removed this bund not only
cut off the water supply from some
six or eight Government villages but
seriously endangered the safety of
two of the masonry Amicus below
it. While engaged in removing the bund
the Rampu Moonsifdar's tankel presented
himself and was exceedingly importu-
nent and defied me to remove it he
at the same time produced a tathu
letter which he said was a permission
from

753
from the Tahsildar to put up the bund,
I then informed him that neither the
Tahsildar nor the Collector had any
authority to interfere with irrigation
works under my charge and without
any reference whatever to me, and
that I did not want to see the Tah-
sildar's permission as he persisted
however on my taking the letter although
I had several times refused to do so
being considerably provoked I at
last took it from him tore it in two
and handed it back. The Moonsifdar
wrote some time afterwards
to know why I destroyed this docu-
ment and the original letter forward-
ed with your Memoirs under reply was
my answer a translation of which
Mr. Foster sent to Board of Revenue.
I am unable to state whether it was
a correct one or not as it was not
sent to me. I beg to express my regret
for having torn the document in
question the circumstances under
which I did so will I trust be
considered

Considered some course.

3. In para 8 of Mr. Dineen's letter in the proceeding under reference, it is stated that Mr. Hoopes and myself gave the Moosvick a permission when the land was removed to take water through a side channel dug from the main channel this is incorrect as far as I am concerned I gave no permission and had no authority to do so. In the same para it is stated that "Mr. Hoopes thinks that the D.P.M. should abide by the terms then promised to the Moosvick, namely of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam" I beg to state that the D.P.M. promise us to remove whatever, and further that the Moosvick never had any right to make a dam and that the only dam he built up was immediately removed. It is true that in my letter No 43 of 6 May 1871 in answer to Mr. Hoopes' letter No 5 dated 20 February 1871 I stated that I gave no objection to the Moosvick's deepening

deepening and widening a certain channel but on inspecting it and from enquiry I afterwards ascertained that there were very considerable objections to so doing and reported them accordingly to you.

I have taken the
Greatest pleasure in
Signed / J. Hammond
Assistant Engineer

/ True Copy /
W. J. H. Fisher Esq. M.C. R.E.
Assistant Engineer.

/ True Copy /

W. S. Foster
Collector.

Godavery District
District Engineer's Office
Dowlamuram 7 October 1873

To
The District Engineer
Godavery District
The Collector of Godavery
Sir,

Encls. 3. Adverting to your letter of the 11th September 1873 No. 129, I have the honor to return the document sent to me together with a copy of Mr. Hannan's explanations.
1. Copy of the 13th Pro. No. 1591 dated 16 Aug. 1873.
1. Telugubhatta
1. Copy of letter from Mr. Hannan with Mr. Hannan's explanation dated 23rd Sept 1873.
2. As Mr. Hannan with Mr. Hanfall acted in perfect good faith for the preservation of Government rights, and Mr. Hannan tendered an apology for having in the excitement of the moment, torn up some document presented to him, I trust the Board will be satisfied so far as their complaint is concerned.

3. It was fortunate that Mr. Hannan did remove the dam at once as there was such a flood in the river all the Muncabad tanks would have been breached and considerable damage done to many villages in the neighbourhood.

4. As regards myself, I personally showed the Muncabad's Vudeel the line he proposed to take could not be allowed as it destroyed some valuable wet cultivation, and pointed out another

1874. 10/10/73
Received from the
Collector Godavery
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Dowlamuram 31 Aug 1874
Recd
No 21
Copy of Mr. Hannan's
letter to the Muncabad

1874. 10/10/73
Recd 1154/74
D. N. 2996/74
1874. 10/10/73
D. N. 2996/74
D. N. 2996/74

line which could be cut without
doing any damage, this they are
determined not to take as these Zemindars
appear to consider that the destruction
of their neighbours property enhances
the value of their own.

5. With reference to Para 1 of the
Benares' Panchajanya No. 1591 dated 16th August
1873, I would advise a survey of the
locality being made to let them see what
is proposed to be done, and this I could
get done for a small sum if placed at
my disposal; as to promises I do not recollect
ever giving any and before any stress
was laid on the assertions of these people,
they should be called upon to produce
written documents to the purpose.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

(Signed) Jno F. Fisher Esq. M.P.

District Engineer Panchajanya

(True copy)

W. S. Foster

Ag Collector

his supply through one channel or
another is a matter of indiffe-
rence so long as the interests of
87.9 Government are not neglected. I
trust therefore that arrangements
may be made at once for affording
him a fair supply of water and
that the necessary work may be
completed this year before the
commencement of the rains.

I have &c &c

/Signed/ J. G. Hoare Esq.
Ag Collector.

/True Copy/

W. S. Foster
Ag Collector.

N^o 25

Godavari District
Subcollector's office
Camp Bandashanka

28th January 1874

From

J. G. Moorfall Esquire
Sub Collector

To

W. S. Foster Esquire
Collector

Sir,

With reference to proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 16th August 1873 regarding the supply of water for the irrigation of the lands of Gosampalem, Pentapalli and Mantapalli villages belonging to the Munsibdar of Rampah, I have the honor to forward herewith copies of the English correspondence of the Telugu origin and orders thereon and of extracts of the register of petitions which have up to far as I can ascertain been hitherto submitted to you complete.

I think it necessary to add that there appears the considerable misapprehensions

On a letter from the
Collector of Godavari District
to the Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
dated 31 January 1874
No 2
1021
Copy of the letter
Collection. No 1021

Recd 11/6/74
No 1152/74
S. N. 2998/74
5
14-9-75
Encl. 11/6/73

N^o 25

Godavari District
Subcollector's office
Camp Bandashanka

28th January 1874

From

J. G. Moorfall Esquire
Sub Collector

To

W. S. Foster Esquire
Collector

Sir,

With reference to proceedings
of the Board of Revenue dated 16th Jan-
-uary 1873 regarding the supply of
water for the irrigation of the
lands of Gosampalem, Pentapalli
and Mantapalli villages belonging
to the Munsibdar of Rampah, I
have the honor to forward herewith
copies of the English correspondence
of the Telugu origin and orders thereon
and of extracts of the register of
petitions which have up to far as
I can ascertain been hitherto sub-
-mitted to you complete.

I think it necessary to add
there appears the considerable mis-
-apprehensions

On a letter from the
Collector of Godavari to
the District Officer
Munsibdar of Rampah
dated 31 January 1874
No 2
1021
Copy of the letter
Collection. No 1021

Recd 10th Feb 1874
No 1152/74
S. M. 2998/74
5
14-2-75
Encl. 14.2.75

-a provision as to the history of
the case briefly to reiterate the facts.
In 1868 the Deputy Tahsildar re-
-ported that the Munsifdar had
improperly raised a bund across
the Barada Colua and thereby di-
-rupted the entire supply of water
to his own tanks depriving numerous
Government villages of the supply
to which they were entitled. Petitions
of Complaint were received from the
Ryots of Government villages and
enquiry made through the Tahsildar,
and finally being dissatisfied with
the different and contradictory
reports I had received, I personally
proceeded to the spot and inspected
the Barada Colua for miles both
above and below where the bund
had been placed, and after careful
enquiry arrived at the conclusion
that the Munsifdar had no right
whatever to erect the bund in
question and that its erection had
seriously affected the Government
villages which depend upon the Barada
Colua

Is not
this
the
promise
YB

Barada for their supply of water.
3. Before I arrived however
Mr. Hansen had cut the bund,
I approved of what he had done
and forbade its recreation by the
Munsifdar directing him in future
to take water to his villages as
heretofore from ^{the} channel taking
off from the Barada Colua above
the Patta Mawidi Aisak.
4. I declined altogether to recognize
the authority of the overseer to
grant permission to the Munsifdar
to erect a bund across the Barada
Colua, as I did not think that
an overseer had power to issue
such an order, when the interests
of Government are materially af-
-fected thereby. I also rejected the
so called Panchayat decision as it
had never been accepted by the
Collector under whose orders the
Panchayat was convened, and as
an agreement between certain ryots
of one Government village and
the

the Munimudari could not be allowed to injuriously affect other Government villages.

5. The question then in dispute and the only one decided by me was whether or not the Munimudari was entitled to erect a substantial fence across the Barada Canal whenever he chose and thereby deprive certain Government villages of their fair supply of water, and this I decided against him, issuing a prohibition which I submit was imperatively called for and by no means "more sweeping than it ought to have been."

6. It was never contended before me that the Munimudari had no claim to a supply of water for his tanks and it is only recently and subsequent to my departure from the District that such a theory has been advanced by the officers of the Public Works Department whether or not he gets his

Revenue Department.

Memo. for Order.

Pro. Board of Revenue, bringing
to notice of Govt. conduct of Range
Officer Mr. Hammar in tearing up
an order issued by the Tahsildar
the subject of the water supply
from Buradaculoo in Hyderabad.

(H.E. 24 March 1874 N. 665)

1874 M.C. 17

Revenue Department

Secretary to Government

Office Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Secy to Board

Secy

Secy

Copy of the Resolution
Engineers' & Mr. G.
the Collector.

24/3/74

Rev. 1154/74

S.P. 2996/74

24/3/74
24/3/74

The Board have sent up all the correspondence about this matter, but it does not seem that any orders are required on the question of the Mansubdar's right to water. The conclusion to be determined is the point which they have come in mind. I shall it - or paragraph 4 of their Proceed. No. 665 dated 24 March 1874 seems all that is required. The point relating to the water supply.

is necessary. Perhaps the Government will express concurrence in the view which they have taken.

The point on which precise orders are wanted is that summarized in paragraph 5 of their Proceedings above mentioned.

Q. C. C.

to Mr. Hannan
I should be trans-

-ferred to the DM.

He should & think
be sent out of the
District at once.

He seems to make
out that he took
up the Sabirian

letter in a moment
of irritation. But

it will be seen
that he wrote &

told the members
that the R. & A.

authorities had no
jurisdiction in the

matter & therefore

there communication

had been destroyed!

His tact in reim-
ster that the C. C.
may have forwarded
an incorrect trans-
lation of this letter
is an aggravation of
his conduct. Cf
Fischer is to blame
for not having called
him to his attention for
his press & counter
impertinences.

I think transfer
to some other District
is the lightest punish-
ment that can
be awarded - but I pro-
pose no more, because
I do not know whether
Mr. Hannan is a pro-

91.3

officer & has one
good work.

S. P. S.

25/4.

Agree
5/6. M. R.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 5th May 1874.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Regarding claims of the
Mansabdar of Rampah and
Kottapally ryots to water
supply from Buradacul
in Godavery District, and
subject of Range Officer No. 1

G. E. 24th March 1874, No. 665.

The Mansabdar is
clearly entitled to water,
and measures should be
adopted at once to deter-
mine the quantity, and
supply it or enable him
to procure it.

2 The subject of para-
graph 5 will be con-
sidered in the Public

Works

Works Department.

WLL

14. To the 22 of Row 210 19 May 1914
21. Public Works Dept. —

ages 30

16-2-1966

Referencer At

OFFICE

LADRAS

EPARTMENT

Press
Mis.
574.
6.

Ued

6/6

13-75

(1) Number of Pages 30
(2) Date of repair 16-2-1966
(3) Initials of the Referencer At

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.		Press
B.P. No.	<u>555</u>	<u>Mis.</u>
Dated	<u>5-5-</u>	<u>1874</u> <u>196</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled